1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	* * *	
9	DOUGLAS R. FENTON,	Case No. 2:16-cv-002356-RFB-CWH
10	Plaintiff,	OPPER
11	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
12	COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	
13	SECURITY,	
14	Defendant.	

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 19] of the Honorable Carl W. Hoffman, United States Magistrate Judge, entered March 9, 2018.

A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct "any review," de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by March 23, 2018. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge's recommendations.

1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 19] is	
2	ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.	
3	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED the Plaintiff's motion for reversal/remand [ECF No. 13]	
4	is DENIED.	
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Commissioner's cross-motion to affirm [ECF No.	
6	14] is GRANTED.	
7	DATED: A.::!116, 2010	
8	DATED: April 16, 2018.	
9	N)	
10	RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II	
11	United States District Judge	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		